

Date of Hearing: April 28, 2021

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
Patrick O'Donnell, Chair
AB 1316 (O'Donnell) – As Amended April 14, 2021

SUBJECT: School accountability: financial and performance audits: charter schools: contracts

SUMMARY: Establishes new requirements for nonclassroom based (NCB) charter schools in the areas of auditing and accounting standards, the funding determination process, adding requirements to the contracting process, Independent Study (IS) program requirements, required teacher to pupil ratios, limiting authorization of NCB charters by small districts, and adding specificity to the authorizer oversight process, as specified. Specifically, **this bill:**

Audit and Accounting Standards

- 1) Requires charter schools to follow the same audit procedures and audit schedules, and use the same Standardized Account Code Structure, as school districts.
- 2) Requires training for school district and charter school auditors as a condition of their licensure, and requires school district and charter school audits to be peer reviewed.
- 3) Creates the Office of Inspector General at the California Department of Education (CDE), to be appointed by the Governor.
- 4) Requires the K-12 audit guide to include sampling guidance, and audit requirements for minimum school day, time value of pupil work, pupil to teacher ratios, the 25 largest monetary transfers, and pupil attendance.

NCB Charter School Funding Determination

- 5) Establishes, beginning July 1, 2022, a funding formula for NCB charter schools based on the amount of in-classroom instruction provided to pupils as follows:
 - a) Pupils engaged in classroom-based instruction for at least 80% of their attendance, generate 100% attendance for state apportionment.
 - b) Pupils engaged in classroom-based instruction for between 60% and 79% of their attendance, generate 92.5% attendance for state apportionment.
 - c) Pupils engaged in classroom-based instruction for between 40% and 59% of their attendance, generate 85% attendance for state apportionment.
 - d) Pupils engaged in classroom-based instruction for between 20% and 39% of their attendance, generate 77.5% attendance for state apportionment.
 - e) Pupils engaged in classroom-based instruction for between 0% and 19% of their attendance, generate 70% attendance for state apportionment.

Independent Study for School Districts, County Offices of Education and Charter Schools

- 6) Establishes, beginning with the 2022-23 school year, a single set of criteria for Independent Study (IS) for school districts, county offices of education (COEs), and charter schools, including:
 - a) Requiring a minimum frequency of teacher and pupil contact once every three school days, including a requirement for more contact for struggling pupils;
 - b) Requiring teacher communication to be via in-person, live visual or audio connection;
 - c) Requiring a minimum school day;
 - d) Requiring a NCB charter school to offer an in-person option as an alternative to serve pupils with exceptional needs and struggling pupils; and
 - e) Requiring governing board policies and governing body policies to include attendance and academic metrics for ending a pupil's IS agreement.

Charter School Contracts

- 7) Requires vendor personnel who provide direct services to pupils that count toward instructional minutes to hold the appropriate credential.
- 8) Prohibits private religious organizations or schools from serving as vendors.
- 9) Requires charter schools to participate in competitive bidding of contracts in the same manner as school districts.
- 10) Prohibits contracts from being calculated as a percentage of charter school apportionment.

Pupil Attendance Data Study

- 11) Requires the CDE to study the feasibility of connecting the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) and the attendance accounting system.

Teacher Assignments, School Calendars, and Pupil Attendance

- 12) Requires school districts, COEs and charter schools to calculate pupil-to-teacher ratios in independent study programs by one of the following methods:
 - a) A 25 to 1 pupil-to-teacher ratio;
 - b) An alternative pupil-to-teacher ratio negotiated as part of a collective bargaining agreement; or
 - c) The prior year pupil-to-teacher ratio at programs operated by the high school or unified school district with the largest average daily attendance of pupils in the county or the

collectively bargained alternative ratio used by that high school or unified school district in the prior year.

- 13) Prohibits multi-track year-round schedules for school districts and charter schools. Authorizes the State Board of Education (SBE) to waive this prohibition in cases of facility shortages.
- 14) Permits NCB charter attendance only for pupils residing within the county in which the school is authorized.

Small School District Authorizers of NCB Charter Schools

- 15) Permits a NCB charter school to be authorized as follows:
 - a) School districts < 2,500 in Average Daily Attendance (ADA) may authorize NCB charters up to 100% of district ADA;
 - b) School districts of 2,500-5,000 ADA may authorize NCB charters up to 2,500 ADA; and
 - c) School districts of 5,000-10,000 ADA may authorize NCB charters up to 50% of district ADA.

Authorizer Oversight and Oversight Fees for Charter Schools

- 16) Establishes the Charter Authorizing Support Team at the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT).
- 17) Requires charter school authorizers to perform the following oversight responsibilities for NCB charter schools:
 - a) Annually verify that an appropriate methodology exists for teachers to determine the time value of pupil work product used to compute ADA.
 - b) Annually verify the ADA-to-certificated-teacher ratio used by the charter school.
 - c) Verify average daily attendance at the first, second, and annual principal apportionment reporting, including subsequent corrected reports, after performing reasonable testing of monthly enrollment and monthly attendance reports to be submitted to the chartering authority by the charter school, to determine enrollment and attendance trends and averages.
- 18) Permits a charter authorizer to charge oversight fees not to exceed actual costs up to 2% for the 2022-23 fiscal year; and, effective July 1, 2023, permits a charter authorizer to charge oversight fees not to exceed actual costs up to 3%.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Establishes the Charter Schools Act of 1992 which authorizes a school district governing board or county board of education to approve or deny a petition for a charter school to

operate independently from the existing school district structure as a method of accomplishing, among other things, improved pupil learning, increased learning opportunities for all pupils, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for pupils who are identified as academically low achieving, holding charter schools accountable for meeting measurable pupil outcomes, and providing the schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance-based accountability systems. (Education Code (EC) 47605)

- 2) Establishes a process for the submission of a petition for the establishment of a charter school. Authorizes a petition, identifying a single charter school to operate within the geographical boundaries of the school district, to be submitted to the school district. Authorizes, if the governing board of a school district denies a petition for the establishment of a charter school, the petitioner to elect to submit the petition to the county board of education. Authorizes, if the county board of education denies the charter, the petitioner to submit the petition to the SBE only if the petitioner demonstrates that the school district governing board or county board of education abused its discretion in denying the charter school. Authorizes a school that serves a countywide purpose to submit the charter petition directly to the county office of education.
- 3) Requires, upon renewal, a charter school to be identified as either low performing, middle performing or high performing based on state dashboard accountability data. Requires that low performing charter schools be denied, however, the school may be renewed for a two year period if the authorizer is presented with verified data that meet specified criteria and the authorizer finds it compelling. Authorizes middle performing charter schools to be renewed for 5 years. Authorizes high performing charter schools to be renewed for 5-7 years.
- 4) Prohibits the authorization and establishment of new nonclassroom based charter schools between January 1, 2020 and January 1, 2022.
- 5) Prohibits a charter school from receiving any public funds for a pupil if the pupil also attends a private school that charges the pupil's family for tuition. Prohibits a charter from being granted that authorizes the conversion of any private school to a charter school. (EC 47602)
- 6) Prohibits, notwithstanding any other law, a local educational agency (LEA), including, but not limited to, a charter school, from claiming state funding for the independent study of a pupil, whether characterized as home study or otherwise, if the LEA has provided any funds or other thing of value to the pupil or his or her parent or guardian that the LEA does not provide to pupils who attend regular classes or to their parents or guardians. (EC 51747.3)
- 7) Authorizes a charter school to receive funding for nonclassroom-based instruction only if a determination for funding is made by the SBE. Requires the determination for funding to be subject to any conditions or limitations the SBE may prescribe. Requires the SBE to adopt regulations that define and establish general rules governing nonclassroom-based instruction that apply to all charter schools and to the process for determining funding of nonclassroom-based instruction by charter schools offering nonclassroom-based instruction. Defines nonclassroom-based instruction to include, but not be limited to, independent study, home study, work study, and distance and computer-based education. (EC 47612.5)
- 8) Requires the SBE to adopt regulations setting forth criteria for the determination of funding for nonclassroom-based instruction, at a minimum the regulation to specify that the

nonclassroom-based instruction is conducted for the instructional benefit of the pupil and is substantially dedicated to that function. Requires the SBE to consider, among other factors it deems appropriate, the amount of the charter school's total budget expended on certificated employee salaries and benefits and on schoolsites, and the teacher-to-pupil ratio in the school. Requires, for the 2003–04 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, the amount of funding determined by the SBE to not be more than 70% of the unadjusted amount to which a charter school would otherwise be entitled, unless the SBE determines that a greater or lesser amount is appropriate. (EC 47634.2)

- 9) Requires a charter school to transmit a copy of its annual, independent financial audit report for the preceding fiscal year to its chartering entity, the State Controller's Office (SCO), the county superintendent of schools of the county in which the charter school is sited, (unless the county board of education of the county in which the charter school is sited is the chartering entity) and the CDE, by December 15 of each year. (EC 47605)
- 10) Requires a charter school that operates a multitrack year round calendar to comply with all of the following:
 - a) Calculate attendance separately for each track. The divisor in the calculation must be the calendar days in which school was taught for pupils in each track;
 - b) Operate no more than five tracks;
 - c) Operate each track for a minimum of 175 days. If the charter school is a conversion school, the charter school may continue its previous schedule as long as it provides no fewer than 163 days of instruction in each track;
 - d) For each track, provide the total number of instructional minutes, as specified in Section 47612.5; and
 - e) No track may have less than 55% of its schooldays before April 15. (EC 47612)
- 11) Authorizes a school district to operate a program of multitrack year-round scheduling at one or more schools within the district. Authorizes a program of multitrack year-round scheduling to operate at a schoolsite for as few as 163 days in each fiscal year if the governing board of the school district adopts a resolution at a regularly scheduled board meeting certifying that both of the following criteria are met at the schoolsite:
 - a) The number of annual instructional minutes is not less than that of schools of the same grade levels utilizing the traditional school calendar; and
 - b) It is not possible for the school to maintain a multitrack schedule containing the same number of instructional days as are provided in schools of the district utilizing the traditional school calendar given the facilities, program, class sizes, and projected number of pupils enrolled at the schoolsite. (EC 37670)
- 12) Requires financial and compliance audits to be performed in accordance with General Accounting Office standards for financial and compliance audits. Requires that the audit guide prepared by the SCO be used in the performance of these audits until an audit guide is adopted by the Education Audits Appeal Panel. When an audit guide is adopted by that

panel, the adopted audit guide be used in the performance of these audits, and that every audit report specifically and separately address each of the state program compliance requirements included in the audit guide, stating whether or not the district is in compliance with those requirements. (EC 14503)

- 13) Authorizes the IS program for school districts, COEs and charter schools. Requires local educational agencies (LEAs) that offer IS to adopt written policies that include the length of time that may elapse between the time an independent study assignment is made and the date the pupil must complete the assigned work, missed work assignments, and there be a written agreement between the pupil and the IS program. Requires that the written agreement include processes for submitting pupil work, objectives and methods of study for the pupil's work, resource that will be made available to the pupil, duration of the agreement, and number of credits to be earned upon completion. A pupil with an Individualized Education Program (IEP) is not authorized to participate in an IS program unless their IEP specifically provides for that participation. Requires that the IS of each pupil be coordinated, evaluated under the general supervision of an employee of the LEA who possesses a valid certification document or an emergency credential. Establishes certificated employee-to-pupil ratios, as specified. (EC 51745–51749.3)
- 14) Authorizes the Course Based Independent Study (CBIS) program for school districts, COEs and charter schools for pupils enrolled in kindergarten and grades 1-12, inclusive, under the following conditions: completion of a signed learning agreement between the pupil and school, courses are taught under the general supervision of certificated employees who hold the appropriate subject matter credential, and are employed by the LEA, courses are annually certified by the LEA governing board or body to be of the same rigor and educational quality as equivalent classroom-based courses and aligned to all relevant local and state content standards, requires certificated employees and pupils to communicate in person, by telephone, or by any other live visual or audio connection no less than twice per calendar month to assess whether the pupil is making satisfactory educational progress, requires an evaluation if the pupil is not making satisfactory educational progress. Requires a written agreement between the CBIS program and the pupil. Specifies that if more than 10% of the total ADA of a school district, charter school, or COE is claimed then the amount of ADA for all pupils enrolled by that LEA that is in excess of 10% of the total ADA for the LEA be reduced, as specified. (EC 51749.5–51749.6)
- 15) Requires each chartering authority to do all of the following with respect to each charter school under its authority:
 - a) Identify at least one staff member as a contact person for the charter school;
 - b) Visit each charter school at least annually;
 - c) Ensure that each charter school under its authority complies with all reports required of charter schools by law, including the local control and accountability plan (LCAP) and annual update to the LCAP required pursuant to Section 47606.5;
 - d) Monitor the fiscal condition of each charter school under its authority; and
 - e) Provide timely notification to the CDE if any of the following circumstances occur or will occur with regard to a charter school for which it is the chartering authority:

- i. A renewal of the charter is granted or denied;
- ii. The charter is revoked; or
- iii. The charter school will cease operation for any reason. (EC 47604.32)

16) Authorizes a chartering authority to charge for the actual costs of supervisory oversight of a charter school not to exceed 1% of the revenue of the charter school. Authorizes a chartering authority to charge for the actual costs of supervisory oversight of a charter school not to exceed 3% of the revenue of the charter school if the charter school is able to obtain substantially rent free facilities from the chartering authority. Authorizes a LEA that is given the responsibility for supervisory oversight of a charter school by the SBE to charge for the actual costs of supervisory oversight, and administrative costs necessary to secure charter school funding. (EC 47613)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown

COMMENTS:

Need for the bill. According to the author, “Upon the discovery of large scale fraud perpetrated by a number of nonclassroom based charter schools, the Legislature imposed a two-year moratorium on the establishment of new NCB charter schools in 2020, with a commitment to reform NCB charter schools during that time period.

One example of such fraud includes *People v. McManus*, where the San Diego County District Attorney’s Office indicted 11 defendants in a fraud scheme involving nineteen A3 Charter Schools. A3 Charter Schools created a partnership with a little league summer sports program and enrolled little league players in their charter school during the summer months to generate state attendance funding, despite A3 Charter Schools having never provided instruction to these little league players. A3 Charter Schools also transferred pupils between charter schools in their network to collect more than one school year of funding per pupil. The A3 Charter Schools case revealed many weaknesses in the State’s education system in the areas of pupil data tracking, auditing, and school finance.

There are also examples of NCB charter schools paying for multi-day family passes to Disneyland, paying for pupil courses at private religious organizations or schools, and paying uncredentialed instructors to provide instruction to pupils.

Loopholes in state law have allowed these unscrupulous practices at NCB charter schools to continue unchecked, wasting State taxpayer dollars. It is time for a correction in State law to halt the hundreds of millions of dollars in fraud and abuse recently seen among NCB charter schools. AB 1316 corrects flaws in current law and improves parity between independent study programs offered by school districts and NCB charter schools.”

Background on charter schools. According to the CDE, as of April 2021, there are 1,294 charter schools in California, with an enrollment of over 675,000 pupils. Some charter schools are new, while others are conversions from existing public schools. Charter schools are part of the state's public education system and are funded by public dollars. A charter school is usually created or organized by a group of teachers, parents, community leaders, a community-based organization, or an education management organization. Charter schools are authorized by school district

boards and county boards of education. A charter school is generally exempt from most laws governing school districts, except where specifically noted in the law. Specific goals and operating procedures for the charter school are detailed in an agreement (or "charter") between the authorizing board and charter organizers.

What is nonclassroom based instruction? Nonclassroom based instruction includes computer-based instruction using software modules, teacher-directed independent study, and traditional home school parents who enroll their children in independent study charter school programs.

A nonclassroom based charter school is defined as a school with less than 80% of its total ADA that is classroom based, in which instruction takes place in a classroom setting. As of April 2021, there were 304 charter schools considered to be NCB. Of that number, 105 charter schools self-identified as providing exclusively virtual or primarily virtual instruction.

Existing law defines charter school nonclassroom based instruction as instruction that does **not** meet the requirements of classroom-based instruction. Those requirements are:

- Charter school pupils are engaged in required educational activities and are under the immediate supervision and control of a certificated teacher;
- At least 80% of the instructional time offered by the charter school is at the schoolsite (defined as a facility that is used primarily for classroom instruction); and
- Pupil attendance at the schoolsite is required for at least 80% of the minimum instructional time.

What does research say about pupil academic achievement at NCB charter schools and virtual schools? Research indicates that students at NCB charters and virtual schools achieve lower rates of academic achievement compared to students at classroom based schools. One review notes, "By any measure, online charter schools perform significantly worse than traditional public schools, and this negative impact carries across every demographic of pupils. So while online schools are indeed needed for pupils whose requirements cannot be met by brick-and-mortar schools, it's clear that the quality of education offered by online charter schools is significantly below the state average. As public policy, legislators should be looking to limit the number of students in online charter schools and should resist calls to expand this sector." (Lafer, 2021)

A 2015 national analysis of NCB charter schools found, "The differences were much larger between classroom-based and non-classroom-based charter schools with the nonclassroom-based charter schools having lower achievement. This result is consistent with a study of Ohio charter schools that found virtual schools performing poorly relative to traditional public schools (TPSs) and other charter schools (Zimmer, et al., 2009). It is consistent as well with findings for Pennsylvania, which has among the highest proportion of online charter pupils. The CREDO (2011) report on Pennsylvania charter schools found that all eight cyber schools then operating performed significantly and substantially worse on both mathematics and reading than TPSs." (Epple, et al., 2015)

The following chart shows the California statewide average student achievement at traditional brick and mortar schools, versus the average pupil performance at online charter schools. This data excludes all schools that mainly serve pupils who are credit deficient (known as DASS alternative schools), however, when DASS schools are included the difference in pupil performance between classroom based schools and online charter schools is even more significant.

Academic Performance, Online Charter Schools, and Statewide Average, Except Alternative Schools

	California statewide average (excluding DASS alternative schools)	Online charter schools (excluding DASS alternative schools)
Distance from Standard, English Language Arts/Literacy	-2	-17.3
<i>ELA Percentile Rank</i>		43.5%
Distance from Standard, Math	-30.4	-78.4
<i>Math Percentile Rank</i>		20.9%
Career & College Readiness	45.5	18.2
<i>Career/College Percentile Rank</i>		37.7%
Graduation Rate	88.5	73.1
<i>Graduation Rate Percentile Rank</i>		23.2%

(Source: In the Public Interest (Lafer, 2021))

Numerous studies indicate online instruction is not as effective as regular classroom instruction:

- A 2011 study of charter school performance in Pennsylvania by the Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) at Stanford University found that each of that state's 8 online charter schools ("cyber schools") significantly underperformed brick and mortar schools and regular (non-virtual) charter schools in reading and math.
- A CREDO study in 2015 concluded that the learning deficit of virtual schools is equivalent to receiving 180 fewer days of math instruction and 72 fewer days of reading instruction. The study's author said that the learning in math was so small that it was "literally as though the student did not go to school for the entire year."
- A year review of virtual schools in Wisconsin by the Gannett Wisconsin Media Investigative Team found that pupils receiving online instruction "often struggle to complete their degrees and repeat grades four times as often as their brick-and-mortar counterparts," and they "trail traditional students in every subject but reading."
- A 2011 report from the Office of the Legislative Auditor in Minnesota reported that full-time online pupils were more likely to completely drop out of school and made less progress on state standardized math tests than pupils in traditional schools.

- A 2011 report from the Ohio Department of Education rated only three of Ohio's 27 virtual schools as "effective" or "excellent."
- A 2006 performance audit by the Colorado Department of Education of that state's virtual schools found that, "in the aggregate, online students performed poorly on the CSAP (Colorado State Assessment Program) exams and had higher repeater, attrition, and dropout rates."

A report by In the Public Interest (*Virtual Public Education in California*, 2015) focused specifically on California Virtual Academy (CAVA) schools, and concluded that "students at CAVA are at risk of low quality educational outcomes, and some are falling through the cracks entirely, in a poorly resourced and troubled educational environment." Among the concerns identified by the report are the following:

- In every year since it began graduating pupils, except 2013, CAVA has had more dropouts than graduates.
- Pupils are eligible to be counted as having attended with as little as one minute of log in time each day.
- K12 California (the California subsidiary of K-12, Inc.) pays itself for services out of CAVA school bank accounts that it (K12 California) manages.
- Competitive bidding is prohibited: K12 California contractually prohibits CAVA schools from seeking another vendor for services that K12 California is willing and able to perform.
- CAVA teachers report that the "vast majority" of the work they do is clerical, preventing them from spending sufficient time teaching.
- Limited local control: individual CAVA location governing boards operate under contract to K12 California and do not "have much leeway in terms of budget, program and contracting decisions independent from K12 California."
- K12, Inc. charges CAVA schools more than they can reasonably pay for administrative and technology services. The shortfall is covered by "budget credits" that are extended by K12, Inc., which results in a "perpetual debt" relationship between CAVA schools and K12, Inc.
- CAVA pupils have lower academic achievement, higher dropout rates, and higher turnover than pupils enrolled in brick-and-mortar schools.

Virtual schools have consistently been shown to underperform brick-and-mortar schools by wide margins. At the same time, California has invested heavily in policies to improve pupil outcomes, including the adoption of rigorous academic content standards, assessments aligned to those standards, and the use of evaluation rubrics (the "California School Dashboard") to monitor school and district performance and identify districts for targeted assistance.

Recent A3 Charter Schools fraud case reveals significant weaknesses in nonclassroom based charter school law. In *People v. McManus* the San Diego County District Attorney’s Office indicted 11 defendants in a fraud scheme involving nineteen charter schools (A3 Charter Schools). The case revealed many weaknesses in state public charter school law in the areas of pupil data tracking, auditing, school finance, and oversight, which resulted in A3 schools repaying more than \$210 million, 13 houses, and numerous shares in third-party companies.

- *Lack of pupil data tracking.* Currently, charter schools submit aggregate attendance data for each school without any information about individual pupils. Oversight agencies do not maintain individual pupil data about enrollments in charter schools they oversee for state funding purposes. One A3 charter school was found to be paying a private company to recruit and collect personal information from pupil athletes. The school then enrolled the athletes in the charter school without their knowledge—thereby fraudulently generating ADA—and paid the recruiting company a portion of the public funds generated as a finder’s fee.
- *Multi-track calendar abuses.* The A3 schools were found to have deceived the state into paying them significantly more funds by manipulating the “multi-track year round calendar,” which charter schools are currently authorized to use. The A3 schools would (1) run a fake summer school to collect funding for pupils that never knowingly enrolled, (2) inflate their fraudulent summer school attendance numbers—to the tune of about 60 percent—by offering fewer days of fake summer school instruction, and (3) transfer pupils between different A3 schools, increasing attendance fraudulently by another roughly 40 percent.
- *Lack of meaningful audit requirements.* The annual audits required by law found little to no malpractice by A3 schools. First, auditors are not required to complete any specialized up-front or ongoing training in school finance or law to audit a charter school. Second, charter schools can choose their auditors—A3 schools were shown to have fired their auditing firms and hired less experienced firms in the rare event that audit findings were made. Third, NCB charter schools are allowed to pick their own samples of pupil documentation showing compliance with independent study laws—enabling A3 to hide the fraudulent aspects of their operation from auditors. Fourth, auditors are not required to audit the education program received by pupils, only compliance with documentation. In the A3 schools, many children were enrolled from sports teams believing they were participating in a fundraiser and had no knowledge they were enrolled in a charter school at all.
- *Flawed funding determination process.* While existing law requires that NCB charter schools only receive full funding in exceptional circumstances—when at least 80% of funding is spent directly serving pupils—the current funding determination process essentially funds all schools at 100%. This is because existing regulations define “instructional and related services” very broadly and charter schools can meet these spending benchmarks without necessarily spending money on pupils. Further, NCB charter schools are only required to request a funding determination, and provide compliance documentation to the SBE, every five years.

- *Perverse financial incentives for charter school authorizers.* Existing law allows charter authorizers to collect oversight fees from charter schools under their authority but does not require authorizers to demonstrate that the fees are spent on meaningful school oversight. Small school districts that approve NCB charter schools serving pupils not located in the district can earn significant oversight fees—creating a built-in incentive to overlook poor charter school practices. For example, Dehesa Elementary School District approved over ten charter schools all providing NCB programs. The district’s oversight fees for the 2017-2018 school year were more than its entire expenditures for all employees hired by the district. When the district learned of improprieties from their charter schools it took no meaningful action. Ultimately, the district collected the oversight fees and only acted to revoke the A3 Charter Schools under its authority once law enforcement was involved.

The chart below illustrates a sampling of current small school districts that have authorized large numbers of nonclassroom based charter schools.

School District Name	School District ADA	Authorized Charter School ADA
New Jerusalem Elementary	22	4,500
Oro Grande	109	3,738
Dehesa Elementary	145	8,532
Maricopa Unified	300	6,067
Julian Union Elementary	311	3,502
Campbell Union	876	6,417
Acton-Agua Dulce Unified	1,080	13,775

(Source: California School Board Association)

Some homeschool charter schools give education dollars to parents. The term homeschool has traditionally been used to describe private homeschool instruction. Some homeschool parents choose to enroll their children in NCB charter schools. When a pupil enrolls in any public charter school, that pupil becomes a public school pupil and is no longer a private school homeschool pupil. Some NCB charter schools cater to these families and offer to share state funding with parents or allow parents to direct how their children’s homeschool funds are spent.

The Horizon Charter Schools website advertises that they offer “More Student Funds for Educational Needs” and states, “Since we’re a public charter school, there are never any tuition fees and most classes, study trips and educational materials can be paid for with your state-provided student funds. To help families get even more from their homeschooling experience, this year we raised the amount of funds you have to spend -- \$2,600 per K-8th grade student and \$2,800 for high school students. That’s \$1,000 more per student than the previous years and more than most other area charter schools provide. In addition, funds can be shared between family members, providing even greater flexibility and choices for parents.”

Feather River Charter School, which is part of the Inspire Public Schools, provides the following description of the instructional funds available to pupils on their website:

	Enrollment Date	Total Fund Amount	Funds upon Enrollment	Funds available December 1, 2019
TK-8 th grade	July 1-October 9, 2019	\$2,600	\$1,500	\$1,100
High School	July 1-October 9, 2019	\$2,800	\$1,700	\$1,100

Inspire describes the appropriate use of these funds to include but not be limited to the following:

Product	Service
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Enrichment Materials • Curriculum • Technology Items • Educational Field Trips 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fine Art Lessons & Classes • Performing Art Lessons & Classes • Academic Enrichment Classes • Tutoring Services • Driver’s Education Courses • Cooking Classes • Gardening Classes • Reading and Writing Classes • STEM Classes

Investigative journalism found examples of inappropriate use of public school funds through vendor contracts. Investigations into the operations of a few NCB charter schools regarding possible inappropriate use of public school funds are on-going. A 2019 investigation by the San Diego Union Tribune found:

- ***Trips to Disneyland and SeaWorld.*** “In California, there’s a way parents can use money from the government to buy multi-day Disneyland Park Hopper passes, San Diego Zoo family memberships, tickets to Medieval Times and dolphin encounters at SeaWorld. There are a handful of charter schools that give pupils’ families as much as \$2,800 to \$3,200 — tax dollars sent to the charter schools — every year to spend on anything they want from a list of thousands of home-school vendors approved by the charters, according to the schools’ websites. ‘If you live in California and you’re not taking advantage of this, I don’t know what to say,’ said Karen Akpan, a home-school charter parent of four who lives in Beaumont. She wrote a recent blog article describing how she used the educational funds to pay for a family trip to Disneyland, Chicago CityPASSes and Legoland tickets, as well as computer coding kits, educational toys, books and subscription cooking kits for her kids.”
- ***California is the only state paying for these types of services.*** “‘I don’t know of any states where they’re paying for the kinds of things they’re paying for in California,’ said Mike

Smith, president of the Home School Legal Defense Assn. a national group that advocates for home-schooling families. ‘Those schools don’t have as many fixed costs as a school that would have a large campus, paying for heat and custodians and all of that. But yet, they get the same amount of money per student from the state,’ said Stephanie Hood, a charter school adviser with the Homeschool Assn. of California. It is relatively easy for home-school charters to recruit pupils, because enrollment happens online and families can request vendors near where they live. Valiant advertised enrollment to families in 34 counties on its website, even though its schools were authorized to operate in only three counties. ‘As you know, that’s why some of the problems have occurred, because there’s so much money in it,’ Smith said. ‘It’s very easy to do. ... It’s just ripe for the kind of things that are going on.’”

- ***Public education dollars spent at private schools.*** Some charter school vendors are businesses or nonprofits that cater to home-schoolers and operate like private schools in that they charge tuition and employ their own teachers, who often are not credentialed by the state. Some vendors provide a wide variety of classes, ranging from electives such as sewing and cooking, to core classes such as traditional English, math and science. Many of these vendors do not call themselves schools, but rather enrichment centers, learning centers, home school co-ops or tutoring academies. Some larger vendors, such as Homeschool Campus and Discovery of Learning, have several campuses, often at churches. Enrolling in a home school charter can allow the pupil to use the charter school’s funds to pay the tuition for these schools, if their assigned charter schoolteacher approves it.
- ***Public education dollars spent at religious schools.*** There also are religiously affiliated vendors, like the Christian-owned Eden Learning Academy, which until recently said on its website that it is based on a ‘Christian Worldview,’ or the Christian Youth Theater, which says on its website that part of its objective is to ‘share the love of Christ in word and deed.’” Inspire Charter School lists Eden Learning Academy and the Christian Youth Theater as vendors on their website.

Funding determination. As noted earlier in this analysis, NCB charter schools are required to obtain a funding determination that is approved by the SBE. This funding determination establishes the percentage of funding the NCB charter school will receive compared to all other traditional classroom based schools. Most charter schools apply for a 100% NCB funding determination. To do so, they must meet the following criteria:

- Spend at least 40% of total public revenue on instructional certificated salary and benefits;
- Spend at least 80% of total public revenue on instruction related services; and,
- Not exceed a 25:1 pupil to teacher ratio.

As of April 2021, only two NCB charter schools receive less than a 100% funding determination. This indicates that despite the analysis performed by the CDE and SBE, the process is not working as intended.

A 2021 report by In the Public Interest illustrates the possible profiteering permitted by the flawed funding determination system at California's NCB charter schools. The report states:

Overpayment for online charter schools is dramatically illustrated in the case of Connections Academy and its parent corporation Pearson. Alongside the Connections Academy schools, Pearson also operates an online private school, the Pearson Online Academy, for Americans stationed abroad who want their children to get an American education or for those in states that do not allow charter schools.

The curriculum for Pearson Online Academy and California Connections Academy schools are the same – both the list of courses and the description of each course's content are virtually identical in both schools. Indeed, when asked if the two schools' classes are sufficiently similar so that a student could seamlessly transfer between one and the other in the middle of a school year, a Pearson company representative stated that the courses line up “apples to apples – so close it's ridiculous.” Another Pearson representative explained that “the private side [Pearson Online Academy] writes the curriculum for the Connections side,” and as a result “transferring credits is no problem.”

But while the product may be the same, the costs for these courses are dramatically different. California taxpayers pay approximately \$10,300 for every student who attends a Connections Academy school. By contrast, the tuition for enrolling in the Pearson Online Academy is just \$4,800 for an elementary school student, \$5,880 for middle school, and \$6,880 for high school. It seems then that California taxpayers are paying a markup of at least 35 percent (approximately \$3,500 per student) above all costs, including reasonable profit. So across all the schools in this chain, California taxpayers are wasting over \$22 million per year.

In other words, if the state of California simply paid all Connections Academy students to attend Pearson's private online school, taxpayers would save over \$22 million per year.

Audit standards. The A3 Charter case illustrated many faults in the way that charter schools are audited compared to school districts.

- Current law allows charter schools to be audited as nonprofit corporations rather than as governmental entities. Nonprofit corporation audits are not nearly as detailed as governmental entity audits. This bill creates parity between charter schools and school districts with regard to audit procedures and schedules so that charter school audits will be as detailed as school districts, and use the Standardized Account Code Structure required of school districts.
- Current law does not require school district and charter school auditors to receive any special training on auditing schools. This bill requires training for school district and charter auditors as a condition of their licensure and updates the audit peer review process to include school audits.
- The law does not provide the CDE the authority to investigate wrongdoing among school districts and charter schools. The federal government has established an Office of the Inspector General at each federal department, including the Department of Education.

This bill emulates the federal process and creates the Office of Inspector General at the CDE.

- Current law does not direct auditors to review many aspects of independent study programs at charter schools. This bill updates the audit guide to include sampling guidance, minimum school day, time value of pupil work, pupil to teacher ratios, the 25 largest monetary transfers, and pupil attendance.

Independent Study. School districts, COEs and charter schools are authorized, but not required, to offer an IS program. Current law provides two options. The first, Independent Study, established in 1989, is the most popular option. The second, Course Based Independent Study, established in 2014, was utilized by approximately 1,000 pupils statewide in the 2019-20 school year. LEAs may administer either, both, or neither program type. IS is the program through which NCB charter schools provide instruction. If either program is offered, it may be done through a variety of formats for pupils in kindergarten through grade 12.

- As a program or class within a comprehensive school;
- Through an alternative school or program of choice;
- Through charter schools;
- In a home-based format;
- Short term (not less than five days);
- Through online courses;
- As an accommodation for pupil travel;
- As special and/or advanced courses; or
- A credit recovery method.

For the most utilized program, IS, local boards or bodies that agree to offer pupils the option of IS as an instructional delivery alternative must make it voluntary. Then they must establish and adopt board policies, including the maximum length of time between assignment and due date, the number of missed assignments that require an evaluation of whether the pupil should remain in IS. They must also have the current written agreement containing all required elements on file for each pupil. The written agreement may be for a term no longer than one year, and is required include the beginning and end dates of the agreement, list of subjects/courses in which the pupil is enrolled and number of course credits to be earned, the methods of evaluation that will be used to determine if the pupil met the learning objective, processes for returning assignments to teachers, among other provisions.

The IS program for each pupil is coordinated and evaluated under the general supervision of an employee of the school district, COE, or charter school who possesses a valid certification document or an emergency credential. There is no minimum requirement or standard for

teacher-pupil contact; a pupil may go an entire semester without seeing their teacher. School districts, COEs, and charter schools may claim apportionment credit for IS only to the extent of the time value of pupil work products, as personally judged in each instance by a certificated teacher. IS teachers are required to be employees of the school district, charter school, or COE who possess a valid certification document. Current law establishes options to calculate the ratio of ADA for independent study pupils to certificated employees, but the options are different for school districts, COEs, and charter schools.

CBIS also requires a board policy and written agreement, and the requirements of both are largely more rigorous than the other IS program. Courses must be annually certified by the governing board of body school district, COE or charter school to be of the same rigor and educational quality as equivalent classroom-based courses, and must be aligned to all relevant state and local content standards. Courses are taught under the general supervision of certificated employees who hold the appropriate subject matter credential, and are employed by the school district, charter school, or COE at which the pupil is enrolled, as specified. Certificated employees and pupils are required to communicate in person, by telephone, or by another live visual or audio connection no less than twice per calendar month to assess whether each pupil is making satisfactory educational progress. If satisfactory educational progress is not being made, the parent/guardian is required to be contacted and an evaluation is conducted to determine whether it is in the best interest of the pupil to remain in the course or whether they should be referred to another program.

Beginning with the 2022-23 school year, this bill creates parity between charter schools and school districts by establishing a single set of criteria for Independent Study (IS) including:

- Frequency of teacher and pupil contact including tiered re-engagement;
- Mode of teacher communication via in-person, live visual or audio connection;
- Minimum school day;
- Requirement to offer an in-person option as an alternative to serve pupils with exceptional needs and struggling pupils; and
- Metrics for ending a pupil's IS agreement.

A conflict exists in current statute regarding special education pupils in NCB charter schools.

This bill corrects an existing conflict in State statute. Currently, some NCB charter schools that do not have an in-person instructional option, counsel pupils to return to their home school district for in-person instruction when independent study isn't the appropriate placement for that pupil. The education budget trailer bill of 2019, however, prohibited charter schools from counseling students out of charter schools for any reason. In order to ensure that NCB charter schools are able to serve all pupils who wish to attend, this bill requires NCB charter schools to offer an in-person option if independent study is not a suitable placement. This is consistent with state and federal law for pupils who have an Individualized Educational Program (IEP), for whom all LEAs and charter schools are required to provide whatever services are called for in a pupil's IEP.

Teacher assignments, school calendars, and pupil attendance. Current law requires IS programs to operate with specified pupil to teacher ratios. Some charter school networks, however, have exceeded these ratios by assigning teachers different groups of pupils at multiple schools. While on paper, it appears that a teacher has a 25-to-one pupil-to-teacher ratio at a single school, in reality, the teacher has a much higher pupil-to-teacher ratio across their entire teaching assignment at multiple schools. This bill requires parity in pupil-to-teacher ratios in independent study programs across a teacher's assignment.

The A3 Charter School case demonstrated the ability of schools to manipulate their calendars to collect far more than one year of attendance funding per pupil from the State. The A3 Charter School used the multitrack year round calendar to run a summer program and erroneously enrolled little league players over the summer months, enrolled them without their parents knowledge, and collected attendance funding without providing any instruction to these children. Further, A3 Charter Schools transferred students between multiple schools in their network over the summer months, using the multitrack year round schedule, and altered their calendar, to collect much more than one year of attendance funding per student. This bill prohibits multi-year-round track calendars for school districts and charter schools to protect the State from paying more than one year of attendance per pupil. The bill further provides a SBE waiver in the case of severe facility shortages, for example those facility shortages seen in Elk Grove Unified School District.

AB 1507 (Smith, McCarty, O'Donnell) in the 2019-20 Session, prohibits NCB charters from establishing satellite facilities outside the boundaries of the district in which they are authorized. Due to the fact that these schools cannot establish facilities in adjacent counties, this bill proposes to permit NCB charter attendance only within the county in which the school is authorized to facilitate increased in-person instructional opportunities. With the attendance boundary more closely matching the area in which the school is authorized to have facilities, more children will be afforded the opportunity to have in-classroom learning opportunities.

CALPADS and ADA data systems. The State's attendance accounting system is not connected to the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS). In other words, when a charter school or school district submits its ADA information to the State, that ADA is not reported along with pupil identification. The State, therefore, does not know for which pupils ADA is being claimed when it processes attendance apportionments. Current law prohibits a school from claiming more than one year of attendance per pupil, however, more than one year of attendance can be paid per pupil if the pupil attends more than one school. This bill requires, by January 2024, the CDE to study the feasibility of connecting CALPADS and the attendance accounting system to allow the State to determine when a pupil generates more than one year of attendance within one calendar year. This is the only way for the State to know precisely when one year of attendance has been generated for a particular pupil, and when the State is paying more than one year of attendance per pupil, per year.

Small district authorizers. Most NCB charter schools are authorized by small rural school districts. Many of these small districts are stretched thin with regard to staff, and in some cases the Superintendent holds many roles like math teacher and school bus driver. These small districts do not have the capacity to provide meaningful charter school oversight. In some cases, these small school districts authorize NCB charter schools as a means to balance their district budgets, through the collection of oversight fees. There are very small school districts

authorizing large NCB charter schools. For example, as outlined in the chart on page 12, there is a school district with 22 district ADA that has authorized 4,500 in charter school ADA. Another district with 1,000 district ADA has authorized over 13,000 in charter school ADA. This bill matches the capacity of small school districts to provide meaningful charter oversight and permits NCB charter schools to be authorized as follows:

- School districts < 2,500 in Average Daily Attendance (ADA) may authorize NCB charters up to 100% of district ADA;
- School Districts of 2,500-5,000 ADA may authorize NCB charters up to 2,500 ADA; and
- School Districts of 5,000-10,000 ADA may authorize NCB charters up to 50% of district ADA.

These requirements will significantly limit, and in some cases stop, the authorization of NCB charters by districts less than 2,500 ADA, and will slow the growth of authorization of NCB charters at districts between 2,500-10,000 ADA.

Authorizer oversight and oversight fees. Charter school authorizers play a vital role in providing oversight over both the academic and fiscal aspects of the charter schools they authorize. In order to provide better oversight, this bill requires increased targeted oversight by authorizers in the following areas:

- Attendance accounting;
- Pupil to teacher ratios; and
- Time value assigned to pupil work.

In order to compensate authorizers for these increased oversight responsibilities this bill proposes to increase oversight fees from 1% of the charter school's revenue (current law) to 3% of the charter school's revenue by July 1, 2023.

Charter school authorizers have very few resources for technical assistance and support of their charter authorizing and oversight work. A few charter authorizers have an office of staff focused on charter school authorizing and oversight, however most authorizers are so small that they do not have any dedicated charter school staff. In the past, these LEAs have relied on the assistance of the Charter Authorizer Regional Support Network (CARNet), while the program was funded with a federal grant. Through CARNet, authorizers received training and attended conferences to polish their expertise in authorizing and oversight. During its tenure, CARNet held 67 regional trainings and conferences with nearly 1,300 participants from across California. The federal grant funding expired and the program lapsed over the last few years.

This bill proposes to re-establish the program as the Charter Authorizing Support Team managed by the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team (FCMAT). This program will provide the necessary training and technical assistance that charter authorizers need as they consider charter school petitions and provide meaningful oversight of the charter schools they authorize.

Arguments in support. The San Diego District Attorney states, “AB 1316 is a tremendous step forward to reforming California’s education system. Many of the proposed reforms, if implemented, would have prevented the fraud in *People v. McManus* from occurring, or would have severely mitigated losses to the State. We emphatically support AB 1316, especially the following proposed measures:

- AB 1316 establishes the office of Inspector General to give the state the ability to provide its own oversight of potential fraud and theft of public funds by public education entities.
- AB 1316 significantly revises the auditing procedures for the California public-school system to include common sense reforms like continuing education, auditor generated sampling and disclosure of related party transactions.
- AB 1316 recognizes the importance of the student master agreement (which serves as the legal justification to obtain public funds) by requiring parties to sign the agreement under penalty of perjury. In *People v. McManus* teachers, at the direction of defendants signed student master agreements for students they did not know giving defendants a ticket to collect millions from the state. Also, well intentioned parents signed student master agreements to help their child fundraise without understanding the legal significance that the documents changed their child’s academic placement and educational record for life.
- AB 1316 eliminates the multi-track calendar system in most circumstances. The multitrack calendar system was the primary means used by the defendants in *People v. McManus* to obtain fraudulent attendance revenue from sports teams over the summer.
- AB 1316 defines the length of a school day for charter schools to receive funding. Due to a lack of clarity and enforcement of existing law, the defendants in *People v. McManus* collected public funds for full school days when students only participated in short sports practices.
- AB 1316 requires third-party vendors providing instruction to students to be qualified.
- AB 1316 limits the ability for a school district to authorize a charter school with nonclassroom-based attendance significantly larger in number than its own student body. Oversight is fundamental to ensuring students are protected and authorizers cannot provide meaningful oversight of schools significantly larger than themselves.
- AB 1316 further clarifies existing law that oversight fees are a reimbursement mechanism—school district authorizers may only legally charge for the actual costs of oversight services provided up to a set percentage and cannot profit from oversight fees from charter schools.
- AB 1316 eliminates the ability for a charter school to enroll students in adjacent counties. The geographic scope of all adjacent counties makes oversight impracticable for most school districts.
- AB 1316 implements a competitive bidding process for charter school vendors like other public educational agencies. This will significantly reduce the risk of related party transactions and fraud.”

Arguments in opposition. The California Charter Schools Association states, “AB 1316 would require all NCBs to offer a parallel site-based program for all high school students and any student who is not succeeding in the independent study setting. This nonsensical and wasteful approach to offering an alternative to traditional classroom-based programming is even more

troubling given the significant constraints on physical operations of NCBs just imposed in AB 1507. By further limiting the geographic scope of enrollment and capping enrollment relative to district size, AB 1316 upends the reforms recently imposed in AB 1507 and would require even more operational restructuring and reorganization, without any evidence the reforms in AB 1507 are working. AB 1316 would mandate funding cuts for all NCBs solely based on the level of classroom instruction, without any quantifiable evidence that correlates to student academic success with in-person instruction. These students have chosen alternative instructional models because they are not academically successful in a classroom-only learning environment. Mandating program cuts without regard to program effectiveness or individual student needs, and based on a single metric, will severely limit the capacity of schools to provide meaningful, innovative and flexible learning opportunities to the most disenfranchised students in California, as well as undermine student success and increase the state's school dropout rate.

AB 1316 ignores the good work and commitment that NCBs offer their community. It is important to note that during the pandemic, all schools became "nonclassroom-based", and many of the leaders in this charter sector openly offered best practices, support and resources to other charter schools and traditional school districts to transition to a more successful distance learning environment for all of California students. These schools were also held to their pre-pandemic requirements for student progress and attendance reporting. We must be careful not to "throw the baby out with the bathwater" as we consider what narrow additional controls may be appropriate to further limit exposure to fraud.

New Audit and Fiscal Reporting and Oversight Requirements are Excessive and Duplicative. AB 1316 would overlay broad new fiscal and operational accountability on ALL charter schools by ignoring the existing annual audit requirements, and the significant impact of fiscal and operational accountability reforms already implemented under AB 1505, AB 1507 and SB 126. By imposing the entirety of the Public Contract Code on charter schools, this bill would blatantly violate the recent agreement on which school district laws should apply to charter schools, and eliminate flexibility, a fundamental element of the charter school model. The new fiscal reporting requirements and audit provisions in this bill are particularly cumbersome and convoluted through the imposition of duplicative and wasteful oversight across many agencies, including independent auditors, charter authorizers, county offices of education, the California Department of Education (CDE) and the State Controller."

Committee amendments. Committee staff recommends the bill be amended as follows:

- 1) Correct a drafting error by removing COEs from the limitation on the number of NCB charters that can be authorized by an authorizing entity.
- 2) Clarify that continuing education training hours are required by all auditors of school districts, county offices of education and charter schools.
- 3) Prohibit payment to charter school employees or employees of an entity managing a charter school for courses completed by pupils; and prohibit gifts to teachers, students and parents for participation in school activities or meetings.
- 4) Clarify that charter schools are authorized to participate in all IS programs, in parity with school districts and COEs.

- 5) Require IS teachers to grade all pupil work; requires schools to keep all pupil work for 2 years for auditing purposes; and requires all pupil work to be dated.
- 6) Require auditors to verify addresses in IS master agreements and sample enrollment every attendance month instead of only one learning period.
- 7) Grandfather in NCB charter schools currently authorized by school districts outside the ADA requirements.
- 8) Authorize a pupil to transfer to a classroom based charter school operated by the same entity.
- 9) Require teachers to assign pupil work prior to the start of each learning period and prohibit the deletion of pupil assignments after the learning period has begun.
- 10) Require a teacher's time value assigned for pupil work to be under the penalty of perjury.
- 11) Technical clean up amendments.

Previous legislation. AB 2990 (C. Garcia) of the 2019-20 Session would have prohibited a charter school from providing financial incentives to a pupil or a parent of a pupil for educational enrichment activities; required a nonclassroom-based charter school to enter into an agreement for the provision of an educational enrichment activity only with a vendor that has been properly vetted and approved; required the governing body of a nonclassroom-based charter school to establish policies and procedures to ensure educational value, pupil safety and fiscal reasonableness before approving any contract for educational enrichment activities; and prohibited educational enrichment activity funds from being used for tuition at a private school or for activities, materials and programs that are religious in nature. This bill was held on the Assembly Floor.

AB 1505 (O'Donnell), Chapter 486, Statutes of 2019, established a two year moratorium on the establishment of nonclassroom based charter schools until January 1, 2022.

AB 1507 (Smith), Chapter 487, Statutes of 2019, prohibits charter schools from being located outside the boundaries of their authorizer and, authorizes nonclassroom-based charter schools to establish one resource center within the jurisdiction of the school district where the charter school is located.

SB 1362 (Beall) of the 2017-18 Session would have expanded the existing oversight requirements of, and increased the oversight fees that can be charged by, charter school authorizers; changed the charter petition review process for school district and COEs governing boards; added special education and fiscal and business operations content to the information that must be included in a charter petition; expanded the authority of a governing board to deny charter petitions; and, required the Legislative Analyst to submit a report to the Legislature on special education services by charter schools. This bill was held in the Senate Education Committee.

SB 329 (Mendoza) of the 2015-16 Session would have required a school district or COE, as part of its review of a charter petition, to consider 1) a report assessing its capacity to conduct

oversight of the charter school and 2) a report of the anticipated financial and educational impact on the other schools for which the school district has oversight obligations. This bill was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 8 X5 (Brownley) of the 2009-10 Session, proposed comprehensive changes to the Education Code consistent with the federal Race to the Top (RTTT) program. This bill would have addressed the four RTTT policy reform areas of standards and assessments, data systems to support instruction, great teachers and leaders and turning around the lowest-achieving schools. This bill would have deleted the statewide charter school cap; proposed enhanced charter school fiscal and academic accountability standards. This bill was held in the Senate Education Committee.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

California Federation of Teachers
 California Labor Federation
 California School Employees Association
 California Teachers Association
 San Diego County District Attorney's Office

Opposition

360 Accelerator Education Partners
 Academia Avance
 Achieve Charter School of Paradise
 Aerostem Academy (charter School)
 Alder Grove Charter School
 Alliance College-ready Public Schools
 Alma Fuerte Public School
 Alpha Public Schools
 Ambassador Sanchez Public Charter
 American River Charter School
 Apex Academy
 Arts in Action Community Charter Schools
 Aspire Public Schools
 Association of Personalized Learning Schools & Services (APLUS+)
 Assurance Learning Academy
 Audeo Charter School
 Baypoint Preparatory Academy
 Bella Mente Montessori Academy
 Big Sur Charter School
 Birmingham Community Charter High School
 Blue Ridge Academy
 Bright STAR Schools
 Caliber Schools
 California Charter Schools Association

California Connections Academy
California Pacific Charter Schools
Camino Nuevo Charter Academy
Century Community Charter School
Champs Charter High School of The Arts
Charter Schools Development Center
Chime Institute
Circle of Independent Charter School
Circle of Independent Learning Charter School
Citizens of The World Charter School
Citrus Springs Charter School
City Charter Schools
Clarksville Charter School
Clayton Valley Charter High School
Connecting Waters Charter Schools
Core Butte Charter School
Core Charter School
Crescent View Charter School
Crescent View South, INC.
Crescent View West Public Charter School
Da Vinci Schools
Desert Sands Charter School
Desert Trails Preparatory Academy
Diego Hills Central Charter School
Ednovate
Educationimpact.us
Element Education
Elite Academic Academy
Empire Springs Charter School
Encore High School Charter School
Endeavor College Prep
Environmental Charter Schools
Epic Charter School
Escuela Popular
Evergreen Institute of Excellence
Excel Academy Charter School
Extera Public Schools
Family Partnership Charter School
Fenton Charter Public Schools
Five Keys Schools and Programs
Forest Charter School
Fusion Charter
Future Is Now Schools
Girls Athletic Leadership Schools Los Angeles
Global Education Collaborative
Goethe International Charter School
Golden Eagle Charter School
Gorman Learning Charter Network
Granada Hills Charter High School

Great Valley Academy Charter School
Great Valley Academy Salida
Greater San Diego Academy Charter School
Green DOT Public Schools California
Griffin Technology Academies
Grossmont Secondary School
Growth Public Schools
Guajome Schools
Harbor Springs Charter School
Harvest Ridge Cooperative Charter School
Hawking Steam Charter School
Heartwood Charter School
Heritage K8 Charter School
Heritage Peak Charter School
Hickman Charter School
Hickman Community Charter District
High Tech Los Angeles
Homeschool Concierge
Icef Public Schools
Ilead California Charter Schools
Innovation High School
Innovative Education Management
Intellectual Virtues Academy Charter School of Long Beach
International School for Science and Culture
Ivytech Charter School
James Jordan Middle School
John Adams Academy
John Muir Charter Schools
Julian Charter School
Kairos Public Schools
Kavod Charter School
Key Charter Advisors, LLC
Kid Street Learning Center Charter School
Kipp Bay Area Public Schools
Kipp Social Public Schools
L.a. Coalition for Excellent Public Schools
LA Vida Charter School
Larchmont Charter School
Lashon Academy
Learn 4 Life
Learn 4 Life Concept Charter Schools
Learn4life Assurance Learning Academy
Learn4life Marconi Learning Academy
Learn4life Paseo Grande Charter
Learning for Life Charter School
Legislation Take Action
Liberty Charter High School
Lincoln Street Charter School
Literacy First Charter Schools

Long Valley Charter School
Los Angeles Academy of Arts and Enterprise
Los Angeles Leadership Academy
Los Feliz Charter School for The Arts
Matrix for Success Academy
Method Schools
Mirus Secondary School
Mission View Public Charter, INC.
Mission Vista Academy
Moxiebox Art INC.
Multicultural Learning Center
National Action Network
Natomas Charter School
Nevada City School of The Arts
New Designs Charter School
New Heights Charter School
New Horizons Charter Academy
New Millennium Secondary School
New West Charter
Northern United - Siskiyou
Northern United Charter Schools
Ocean Grove Charter School
Odyssey Charter Schools
Olive Grove Charter School
Opportunities for Learning - Baldwin Park
Opportunities for Learning Duarte, INC.
Options for Youth - San Gabriel
Options for Youth - San Juan
Options for Youth Charter School Duarte
Options for Youth Charter Schools
Options for Youth-acton
Options for Youth-victor Valley
Orange County Academy of Sciences and Arts
Orange County Workforce Innovation High School
Pacific Charter Institute
Pacific Community Charter School
Pacific Springs Charter School
Pacific View Charter School
Palisades Charter High School
Para Los Ninos
Partnership Schools of The Central Coast
Partnerships to Uplift Communities Schools
Pathways Charter School
Perseverance Prep
Plumas Charter School
Public Policy Charter School
Public Safety Academy of San Bernardino
Public Works Group
Puc National

Redwood Academy of Ukiah
Redwood Coast Montessori
Redwood Preparatory Charter
Renaissance Arts Academy
Resolute Academy
Rex and Margaret Fortune School of Education
Rio Valley Charter School
River Montessori Charter School
River Oaks Academy
River Springs Charter School
River Valley Charter School
Rocketship Public Schools
Samueli Academy
San Diego Cooperative Charter Schools
San Diego Workforce & Innovation High School- Lakeside and Lemon Grove
Santa Rosa Academy
Scholarship Prep Charter School
Sebastopol Independent Charter
Shasta Charter Academy
Shasta View Academy
Sherman Thomas Charter School
Sierra Charter School
Sky Mountain Charter School
Soar Charter Academy
Soleil Academy
South Sutter Charter School
Springs Charter Schools
Steller Charter School
Stem Prep Schools
Stockton Collegiate International Schools
Stride, INC.
Summit Public Schools
Sutter Peak Charter Academy
Sweetwater Secondary School
Synergy Academies
Temecula Preparatory School
The Charter School of San Diego
The Circle of Independent Learning
The Classical Academies
The Cottonwood School
The Learning Choice Academy Charter School
Tracy Learning Center
Twin Ridges Home Study Charter School
Uncharted Shores & Academy
Union Street Charter School
Urban Discovery Academy
Valley View Charter Prep
Vaughn Next Century Learning Center
Ventura Charter School of Arts and Global Education

Village Charter Academy
Visions in Education
Vista Charter Public Schools
Vista Real Charter High School
Vista Springs Charter School
Volunteers of America Community Education and Development Corporation
Vox Collegiate of Los Angeles
West Park Charter Academy
Western Sierra Charter Schools
Westlake Charter School
Wonderful College Prep Academy
Young, Minney & Corr, LLP
Youth Policy Institute Charter Schools
Yuba River Charter School
Numerous Individuals

Analysis Prepared by: Chelsea Kelley / ED. / (916) 319-2087